

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the polarizing layer is directly laminated on said optical compensation film by coating of a polarizing-layer forming material on the compensating plate, claim 10 has been amended to depend on claim 1, and claim 19 and 20 have been amended to correct a typographical error. Support for the added recitation in claim 1 is found in the original application, in particular on page 13, line 8 of the specification.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Independent claims 1 and 10 are directed to a liquid crystal display wide viewing angle polarizing film. Claims 2-6 and 19 are dependent on claim 1 and claims 11-15 and 20 are dependent on claim 10. Claims 7 and 16 are directed to a production method dependent on claim 1 and 10, respectively. Claims 8 and 17 are directed to a polarizing adhesion film. Claims 9 and 18 are directed to a liquid crystal display dependent on claim 8 and 17, respectively.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 5-11 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 2000-321426, the publication on November 24, 2000 of the Japanese application corresponding to US 6,404,469 (Kitagawa), and claims 3-4 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kitagawa in view of US 6,245,399 (Sahouani).

Reference is also made in the Office Action to US 5,220,447 to Yokokura et al. (Yokokura) for the proposition that not using adhesive improves optical properties.

As a preliminary, withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action is respectfully requested. The rejection of claims 1-2, 5-11 and 14-18 as presently set forth in the Office Action is in fact a rejection over a combination of Kitagawa and Yokokura (further in view of Sahouani for claims 3-4 and 12-13). Accordingly, the present rejections are new rejections, which should be non-final

to give the Applicants a fair opportunity to address the rejection. In particular, Yokokura does not simply explain a general knowledge in the art but constitutes a very specific technical disclosure, which clearly constitutes an important element of the new rejection set forth in this Office Action.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the finality of the Office Action should be withdrawn.

Further, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. All the cited references disclose polarizers which are conventional polarizers. In particular, Yokokura suggests coating a phase plate on a conventional polarizer, not coating a polarizing layer on a compensation plate. Specifically, Yokokura forms a thin phase plate on a conventional polarizer or the substrate of a liquid crystal cell. Thus, Yokokura does not teach or suggest a polarizing layer formed by coating, and does not provide any motivation to use anything other than a conventional polarizer like the one used in Yokokura. Further, Sahaoui applies the solution disclosed therein to form a conventional polarizer which is then conventionally laminated with other optical layers (see Examples 6 and 7, cols. 9-10 of Sahaoui). Therefore, neither Yokokura nor Sahaoui remedy the deficiencies of Kitagawa.

In contrast, the polarizing film of the presently claimed invention has a polarizing layer which is laminated on said optical compensation film by coating of a polarizing-layer forming material on the compensating plate, as recited in present claim 1. This feature and its advantages are not taught or suggested in any of the cited references, which are completely silent as to a polarizing layer formed by coating. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over the cited combination of references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No.: 020612
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 822-1100
Fax: (202) 822-1111
Customer No.: 38834
NES:rep